

REMARKS

In the June 4, 2009 Office Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the June 4, 2009 Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8-10 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-10 are pending, with claims 1 and 8-10 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 3-6 of the Office Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 10-211359 (Murasaki). In the Office Action, this patent publication is shown as Matsuzaki; however, Applicant believes it to be Murasaki. In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8-10 as mentioned above.

More specifically, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite as follows:

a first running commentary function is for performing play-by-play or commentary relating to the video game using the running commentary terminology, where the play-by-play or commentary includes various phrases, the phrases are collected as a first phrase group, the phrase of the first phrase group includes the running commentary terminology, and the play-by-play or commentary is performed with the phrases collected as the first phrase group;

a running commentary interrupting function is for interrupting phrase of the first phrase group running on the process of the first running commentary function when specific events have occurred while the video game is in progress;

a second running commentary function is for performing the play-by-play or the commentary relating to the specific events when the process of the running commentary interrupting function has been executed, where the play-by-play or commentary includes various phrases, the play-by-play or commentary relates to the specific events, the phrases are collected as a second phrase group, the phrase of the second phrase group includes the running commentary terminology, and the play-by-play or commentary is performed with the phrases collected as the second phrase group;

a running commentary returning function is for returning from the phrase of the second phrase group performing on the second running commentary function to the phrase of the first phrase group interrupted on the process of the running commentary interrupting function when the specific events have occurred; and

a running commentary continuing is for continuing the play-by-play or commentary, the play-by-play or commentary being performed with the phrase of the first group on the basis of running commentary terminology which is terminology interrupted by the running commentary interrupting function, when the process of the running commentary returning function has been executed.

Murasaki was cited in the Office Action to reject claim 1 by showing a terminal storing function in paragraph [0005], a first running commentary function in paragraph [0077], a second running commentary function in paragraphs [0029]-[0032], a running commentary returning function in paragraph [0064], and a running commentary continuing function in paragraphs [0033]-[0036]. Also, The Office Action states in Response to Arguments section that during a soccer game while commentary is running and a particular player is carrying the ball, if the ball goes out of the playing area, the comment would shift from that particular player to something like ball out of bound; however, when the throw-in occurs, the commentary again resume for the playing the ball within the field. Therefore, the Office Action states that this arrangement in Matsuzaki is considered to be returning to the interruption point.

Murasaki appears to disclose selecting a box shown as airg.box on the basis of conditions in Fig. 3, as well as paragraph [0040]. One of text data from the box is selected, according to Fig. 4 and paragraph [0041]. Applicant respectfully asserts that **selecting the box and the text data from the box is not equivalent to the interrupting function** of the claimed invention because simply Murasaki does not teach interrupting. Murasaki also appears to disclose executing various processes. For example, as shown in Fig. 4, the box contains a command q. If the command q is selected, a commentary is not played back.

Namely the command q is for **creating a silent moment in the game, but the command q is not for interrupting.**

Further, there is a condition shown as fairgrf in Fig. 4, which is described in paragraph [0046]. Applicant believes that when this condition happens, a different box shown as airgrf.box is selected. Therefore, Applicant believes that **fairgrf is for changing objects to play back, but not interrupting the airg.box.**

Moreover, in paragraph [0044] and Fig. 4, Murasaki appears to disclose a jump command shown as jcirg, which is executed **after a commentary is finished, but not interrupted.**

As described above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Murasaki appears to be playing back a commentary by continuously playing back two other commentaries. However, Applicant believes that Murasaki is silent with regards to **returning** to a point of a commentary where the commentary is interrupted in order to play back another commentary. Namely, Applicant believes that the way of controlling the commentaries of the claimed invention is quite different from one disclosed in Murasaki, although the claimed invention and Murasaki superficially look alike only in playing different commentaries. Therefore, the commentary played back in the claimed invention is believed to be unique. Using the example in a soccer game which is described in the Office Action, Applicants believes that after the ball is out of bounds, a different commentary is played back, but it is **not** retuning to the point of time when the original commentary is interrupted.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the above mentioned arrangements are **not** disclosed or suggested by Murasaki or any other prior art of record; therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent 2-7 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, claims 2-7 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

As claims 8-10 similarly recite, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8-10 are allowable over the prior art of record for the same or similar reasons stated above.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-10 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Akiyoshi Onda/
Akiyoshi Onda
Reg. No. 63,773

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: September 3, 2009

S:\08-AUG09-AO\KC-US030568 Amendment.doc